DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 931 SO 012 319

AUTHOR Gober, Patricia
TITLE Population Policy and the Changing Distribution of the U.S. Population--Implications for Teaching Population Geography.
PUB DATE Oct 79
NOTE 33p.; Paper prepared for Annual Meeting of the National Council for Geographic Education (Mexico City, Mexico, October 30-November 3, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Birth Rate; Demography; Economic Factors; Federal Aid; Geographic Regions; Geography Instruction; *Government Role; Higher Education; *Migration Patterns; *Population Distribution; *Population Education; *Population Trends; *Public Policy; Tables (Data); Trend Analysis; Urban to Rural Migration

ABSTRACT

The role of migration and of federal policy in population redistribution should be a central focus in population geography education. Although migration to the Sunbelt and the West has been a pattern since the 1950s, a significant trend has been noted only since the 1970s, when the birth rate dropped so much that natural increase could not compensate for out-migration in the North. Factors contributing to this migration pattern include climate, high rates of employment, and territorial bias in federal expenditures. The South Atlantic and South Central and western regions of the Mountain and Pacific states tend to be the main benefactors of defense contracts, highway and sewer programs, federal retirement programs, and maintenance of public lands. In addition, foreign immigrants tend to settle in these regions. A second trend in population distribution is that of growth in nonmetropolitan areas, which is a result of decentralization of metropolitan economic activity and the desire of a majority of Americans to reside in small and rural areas. In conclusion, migration and federal policy must be regarded as interdependent processes. The most obvious consequence of regional shifts in population will be the reapportionment of Congressional representatives after the 1980 census. Federal revenue sharing programs will also be affected. These factors illustrate the need for the policy implications of population redistribution to be an important component in population geography courses.
(Author/KC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Gober

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FEB 11 1980

ED180931

# POPULATION POLICY AND THE CHANGING DISTRIBUTION OF THE U. S. POPULATION--IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING POPULATION GEOGRAPHY

(Prepared for the 1979 Mexico City Meetings of the National Council for Geographic Education)

Patricia Gober
Arizona State University
October, 1979

SP 012 319

# POPULATION POLICY AND THE CHANGING DISTRIBUTION OF THE U. S. POPULATION-IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING POPULATION GEOGRAPHY

## Introduction

As the U. S. enters its third century as a nation, several precedent setting changes in its population distribution have come to light. The first of these involves the emergence of the South as a vital economic force and as a magnet for migrants from the North. On a sub-regional level, a reversal in traditional migration patterns has resulted in movement away from large metropolitan areas, the traditional foci of national growth and development into nonmetropolitan America. What is perhaps most significant about this trend is that in-migration and population growth have not been confined to nonmetropolitan counties that border SMSAs but have occurred in more isolated rural regions as well.

Although the seeds of these changes have been germinating for some time, it has been only recently that they have been extensively reviewed in the popular press and scientific community. As a result, very little attention has been directed to their policy implications. It will be argued that changing migration patterns will require a reanalysis of government's role in relation to population redistribution. Concern with overconcentration in large metropolitan areas and population decline and its attendant problems in small towns and rural areas should change to an emphasis on metropolitan decline and how to accommodate for massive influxes of people in nonmetropolitan communities.

In conjunction with the aforementioned redistribution of the U. S. population and the government's role in giving rise to it, the focus of our population geography courses will need to shift away from the overcentration of population in large metropolitan centers and central city-suburban relationships to a concern with Sunbelt migration and the growth of small metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. We need to recognize the multi-faceted complexion of contemporary population redistribution and to integrate this into our educational objectives in population geography.

Large-scale fertility decline in this country has led to a condition whereby migration has become the most important determinant of regional population growth. As a result, migration should be the primary focus of the teaching of population geography in a U. S. context. I believe that too much attention has been directed to the geographic aspects of fertility and mortality at the expense of the mirgration process, the most inherently geographic of the components of population change. All too often texts in population geography focus on the natural processes of birth and death and devote only a single chapter to migration. Even then, the discussion tends to concentrate on the selectivity of migration rather than on the geographic consequences of population movement. As a result, students fail to grasp the underlying importance of migration in shaping the population of the U. S. and in affecting its spatial distribution.

The purpose of this paper is to outline recent changes in the population distribution of the U. S. and to suggest areas in which the federal government has played a role. In addition, the importance of policy-oriented discussion in population geography education will be reviewed.

## Migration Trends

### Regional Patterns

The most well publicized of recent migration trends involves the general southward migration of population to regions euphemistically called the "Sunbelt." Actually, the origins of this movement began several decades ago, but they did not attract widespread attention in the popular press or scientific community until recently. Watkins (1978) has presented evidence in support of this thesis showing that growth in Sunbelt metropolitan areas was well underway during the 1950s and 1960s.

So why the recent burst of interest in Sunbelt growth? Prior to 1970 natural increase compensated for net out-migration in large northern states like New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois, and growth in the Sunbelt was concentrated in Florida, Texas, California and Arizona. Table 1 shows the absolute magnitude of population growth and the relative importance of its natural increase and migration components for U. S. states and census regions between 1960 and 1977. It is noteworthy that during the 1960s the northern regions (New England, Mid-Atlantic, East North Central and West North Central) experienced sizable population growth in spite of net out-migration or very small net in-migration.

During the 1970s fertility dropped below replacement levels due to the increased costs of supporting children, women's participation in the work force, and changing values and life styles. As a result, natural increase was no longer large enough to compensate for net out-migration in the North. Moreover, in-migration diffused from its foci in Florida and Texas such that all states in the South Atlantic and South Central regions experienced net in-migration during the 1970s. Although Florida's net migration accounted

TABLE 1 COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE IN STATES, 1960-1975

( ' 000s)

| | NET CHANGE | | NATURAL INCREASE | | NET MIGRATION | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 |
| New England | 1338 | 394 | 1022 | 358 | 316 | 37 |
| Maine | 24 | 91 | 94 | 39 | -69 | 52 |
| New Hampshire | 131 | 111 | 62 | 33 | 69 | 78 |
| Vermont | 55 | 39 | 40 | 20 | 15 | 18 |
| Massachussets | 541 | 93 | 466 | 143 | 74 | -51 |
| Rhode Island | 90 | -15 | 78 | 24 | 13 | -39 |
| Connecticut | 497 | 76 | 282 | 98 | 214 | -22 |
| Mid Atlantic | 3034 | -175 | 2976 | 1057 | 59 | -1232 |
| New York | 1458 | -318 | 1509 | 555 | -51 | -873 |
| New Jersey | 1101 | 158 | 614 | 234 | 488 | -76 |
| Pennsylvania | 475 | -16 | 853 | 267 | -378 | -283 |
| East North Central | 4028 | 791 | 4180 | 1988 | -153 | -1197 |
| Ohio | 946 | 44 | 1072 | 507 | -126 | -464 |
| Indiana | 531 | 135 | 548 | 281 | -16 | -146 |
| Illinois | 1033 | 132 | 1076 | 514 | -43 | -382 |
| Michigan | 1052 | 248 | 1025 | 495 | 27 | -247 |
| Wisconsin | 466 | 233 | 461 | 191 | 4 | 42 |
| West North Central | 930 | 557 | 1529 | 657 | -599 | -100 |
| Minnesota | 391 | 169 | 417 | 179 | -25 | -11 |
| Iowa | 68 | 54 | 250 | 97 | -183 | -43 |
| Missouri | 358 | 123 | 355 | 156 | 2 | -33 |
| North Dakota | -15 | 36 | 80 | 34 | -94 | 1 |
| South Dakota | -14 | 23 | 81 | 33 | -94 | -11 |
| Nebraska | 72 | 76 | 145 | 67 | -73 | 10 |
| Kansas | 70 | 77 | 201 | 90 | -130 | -13 |

| | NET CHANGE | | NATURAL INCREASE | | NET MIGRATION | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 |
| South Atlantic | 4700 | 3627 | 3367 | 1527 | 1332 | 2100 |
| Delaware | 102 | 34 | 64 | 29 | 38 | 5 |
| Maryland | 822 | 215 | 437 | 175 | 385 | 42 |
| Virginia | 682 | 483 | 540 | 250 | 141 | 233 |
| West Virginia | -116 | 115 | 149 | 66 | -265 | 49 |
| North Carolina | 526 | 441 | 620 | 299 | -94 | 142 |
| South Carolina | 208 | 285 | 357 | 187 | -149 | 98 |
| Georgia | 646 | 460 | 596 | 316 | 51 | 144 |
| Florida | 1838 | 1661 | 511 | 183 | 1326 | 1478 |
| South Central | 3125 | 3409 | 3465 | 2059 | -740 | 1351 |
| Kentucky | 181 | 238 | 208 | 166 | -153 | 72 |
| Tennessee | 357 | 373 | 402 | 196 | -45 | 178 |
| Alabama | 177 | 245 | 410 | 196 | -233 | 49 |
| Mississippi | 39 | 172 | 306 | 160 | -265 | 13 |
| Arkansas | 137 | 221 | 208 | 193 | -71 | 128 |
| Louisiana | 386 | 277 | 516 | 257 | -130 | 19 |
| Oklahoma | 238 | 251 | 217 | 119 | 13 | 133 |
| Texas | 1617 | 1632 | 1471 | 871 | 146 | 760 |
| Mountain | 1429 | 1741 | 1122 | 756 | 307 | 985 |
| Montana | 20 | 67 | 78 | 39 | -58 | 27 |
| Idaho | 46 | 144 | 88 | 65 | -42 | 79 |
| Wyoming | 2 | 74 | 42 | 26 | -39 | 49 |
| Colorado | 453 | 409 | 238 | 160 | 213 | 249 |
| New Mexico | 65 | 173 | 195 | 99 | -130 | 74 |
| Arizona | 470 | 520 | 243 | 163 | 228 | 358 |
| Utah | 169 | 209 | 180 | 167 | -11 | 42 |
| Nevada | 203 | 145 | 60 | 36 | 144 | 108 |

| | NET CHANGE | | NATURAL INCREASE | | NET MIGRATION | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1977 |
| Pacific | 5328 | 2683 | 2780 | 1487 | 2547 | 1196 |
| Washington | 556 | 245 | 307 | 160 | 249 | 85 |
| Oregon | 323 | 285 | 164 | 94 | 159 | 191 |
| California | 4236 | 1925 | 2123 | 1107 | 2113 | 817 |
| Alaska | 76 | 105 | 60 | 42 | 16 | 62 |
| Hawaii | 137 | 125 | 127 | 84 | 11 | 40 |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Preliminary Intercensal Estimates of States and Component of Population Change, 1960 to 1970," Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 460, June, 1971.

for more than all states (excluding Texas) put together, the data show a pattern of positive net migration that is consistent over the region. In the the West, a similar situation occurred. During the 1970s net in-migration diffused from California, Arizona and Colorado into other Mountain and Pacific Coast states.

Another perspective on migration patterns can be obtained from an examination of Table 2 which shows net migration rates by region and race for the 1970s. Throughout the decade, the Northeast and North Central regions were net losers while the South and West were net gainers in population. A particularily interesting trend is for blacks to be leaving the North and moving in the direction of the South and West. At least in net terms, the black movement from the South to the North has come to an end. However, Southern gains have been greatest for whites as evidenced by in-migration rates of 7.5 percent in 1970 and 1975 and 4.8 percent in the three years between 1975 and 1978.

A thorough review of reasons for regional migration flows is beyond the scope of this endeavor, but several factors have received attention in the literature. In any discussion of migration to the Sunbelt, the operation of climatic favorability cannot be ignored. In several studies, climatic variables have successfully explained interstate variations in migration rates (Greenwood, 1969; Schwind, 1975). In addition, high rates of employment and income growth in the region appear to have induced in-migration. Because of the interdependent nature of the relationship between migration and economic change, in-migration, in turn, stimulates further growth in employment and income (Okun, 1967; Gober-Meyers, 1978).

TABLE 2 IN, OUT AND NET MIGRATION RATES
FOR REGIONS, 1970 - 75 and 1975 - 78

| | 1970 - 1975 | | | 1975 - 1978 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | IN | OUT | NET | IN | OUT | NET |
| Northeast | 2.3 | 5.3 | -3.0 | 1.9 | 3.3 | -1.4 |
| whites | 2.3 | 5.3 | -3.0 | 1.9 | 3.2 | -1.3 |
| blacks | 3.0 | 4.6 | -1.6 | 1.5 | 5.3 | -3.8 |
| North Central | 3.3 | 5.6 | -2.3 | 2.7 | 4.0 | -1.3 |
| whites | 3.3 | 5.7 | -2.4 | 2.6 | 4.0 | -1.4 |
| blacks | 3.5 | 4.7 | -1.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | - .1 |
| South | 6.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 1.6 |
| whites | 7.5 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 1.8 |
| blacks | 2.7 | 2.6 | .1 | 2.2 | 2.0 | .2 |
| West | 6.8 | 4.7 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 4.1 | 1.0 |
| whites | 7.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 5.1 | 4.3 | .8 |
| blacks | 8.0 | 2.7 | 5.3 | 8.5 | 4.0 | 4.5 |

Source: U.S. Bureau, the Census, "Geographic Mobility of the Population, 1970-1975," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 285, October, 1975. U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Geographic Mobility of the Population, 1975-1980," Current Population Reports, No. 331, November, 1978.

The role of the federal government in stimulating in-migration to the South and West is manifest in a number of indirect forms. The first of these involves the territorial bias associated with federal spending (Rundquist, et. al.,.1972; Business Week, 1976; Sutton, 1978). Federal expenditures include defense contracts, payrolls to military and nonmilitary personnel, highway and sewer programs, welfare (medicaid, aid to families with dependent children, food stamps, supplemental security income, grants to states of social service programs and unemployment compensation), federal retirement programs and the maintenance of public lands. Large and significant regional variations occur in the area of defense spending where at best, activities are allocated on the basis of cost effectiveness and at

worst, their location reflects pork barrel whims of Congressmen seeking favors for local districts. In either case, the distribution of federal defense monies has occurred without concern for its regional development consequences or its impact on population distribution or migration trends.

Table 3 illustrates the regional distribution of federal taxation and spending on a per state basis in 1976. The net flow column indicates the net outflow or inflow of federal dollars to regions and states and the last column, called the spending-taxes ratio shows the amount of money spent for every dollar of tax money paid. The data show very clearly the regional imbalance in taxation and spending by the federal government. The largest outflows occurred in the Mid-Atlantic and East North Central regions which together experienced a net loss of more than $30 billion. The East North Central states were particularly disadvantaged by the pattern of federal spending as evidenced by the fact that they received in federal spending only 70 percent of what was collected in taxes.

The main benefactors of geographically biased federal spending were the South Atlantic, South Central and Western regions of Mountain and Pacific states. In the South net inflows that occurred in Maryland and Virginia were undoubtedly due to their proximity to Washington, D. C., the center of federal employment, but other states in the region like Georgia, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi were also favored with large inflows of federal dollars.

In the West, the lion's share of federal net inflows of money occurred in California, but other Sunbelt states like Arizona and New Mexico also received sizable inflows of federal dollars. An anti-federalist attitude that permeates the press and policies in Arizona and others of these states

TABLE 3 FEDERAL EXPENDITURES AND TAXES BY STATE AND REGION, 1976

| | Per Capita Taxes | Per Capita Expenditures | Taxes (million $s) | Expenditures (million $s) | Net Flow (million $s) | Spending - Taxes Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New England | $ 1,676 | $ 1,599 | $ 20,458 | $ 19,519 | $ -939 | .95 |
| Maine | 1,227 | 1,579 | 1,305 | 1,680 | 375 | 1.29 |
| New Hampshire | 1,477 | 1,466 | 1,207 | 1,197 | -10 | .99 |
| Vermont | 1,308 | 1,503 | 620 | 712 | 92 | 1.15 |
| Massachusetts | 1,662 | 1,626 | 9,658 | 9,451 | -207 | .98 |
| Rhode Island | 1,580 | 1,494 | 1,468 | 1,388 | -80 | .95 |
| Connecticut | 1,995 | 1,638 | 6,199 | 5,090 | -1,109 | .82 |
| Mid-Atlantic | 1,718 | 1,405 | 64,051 | 52,374 | -11,677 | .82 |
| New York | 1,770 | 1,510 | 32,009 | 27,299 | -4,710 | .85 |
| New Jersey | 1,886 | 1,271 | 13,835 | 9,321 | -4,514 | .67 |
| Pennsylvania | 1,535 | 1,328 | 18,207 | 15,754 | -2,453 | .87 |
| East North Central | 1,633 | 1,142 | 66,858 | 46,764 | -20,094 | .70 |
| Ohio | 1,578 | 1,132 | 16,902 | 12,125 | -4,777 | .72 |
| Indiana | 1,451 | 1,062 | 7,700 | 5,639 | -2,061 | .73 |
| Illinois | 1,822 | 1,288 | 20,426 | 14,447 | -5,979 | .71 |
| Michigan | 1,662 | 1,071 | 15,140 | 9,751 | -5,389 | .64 |
| Wisconsin | 1,454 | 1,044 | 6,689 | 4,803 | -1,886 | .72 |
| West North Central | 1,401 | 1,438 | 23,460 | 24,079 | 619 | 1.03 |
| Minnesota | 1,432 | 1,271 | 5,645 | 5,010 | -635 | .89 |
| Iowa | 1,400 | 1,101 | 4,013 | 3,155 | -858 | .79 |
| Missouri | 1,388 | 1,847 | 6,624 | 8,815 | 2,191 | 1.33 |
| North Dakota | 1,275 | 1,714 | 816 | 1,097 | 281 | 1.34 |
| South Dakota | 1,145 | 1,464 | 783 | 1,001 | 218 | 1.28 |
| Nebraska | 1,433 | 1,194 | 2,219 | 1,849 | -370 | .83 |
| Kansas | 1,464 | 1,373 | 3,361 | 3,151 | -210 | .94 |

TABLE 3 (con't)

| | Per Capita Taxes | Per Capita Expenditures | Taxes (million $s) | Expenditures (million $s) | Net Flow (million $s) | Spending - Taxes Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| South Atlantic | $ 1,427 | $ 1,577 | $ 47,248 | $ 52,240 | $ 4,992 | 1.11 |
| Delaware | 1,912 | 1,204 | 1,109 | 698 | -411 | .63 |
| Maryland | 1,745 | 2,012 | 7,211 | 8,315 | 1,104 | 1.15 |
| Virginia | 1,466 | 2,050 | 7,341 | 10,263 | 2,922 | 1.40 |
| West Virginia | 1,154 | 1,317 | 2,088 | 2,383 | 295 | 1.14 |
| North Carolina | 1,244 | 1,249 | 6,787 | 6,816 | 29 | 1.00 |
| South Carolina | 1,164 | 1,393 | 3,296 | 3,945 | 649 | 1.20 |
| Georgia | 1,299 | 1,432 | 6,428 | 7,086 | 658 | 1.10 |
| Florida | 1,554 | 1,524 | 12,986 | 12,734 | -252 | .98 |
| South Central | 1,227 | 1,447 | 42,484 | 50,106 | 7,622 | 1.18 |
| Kentucky | 1,149 | 1,483 | 3,915 | 5,055 | 1,140 | 1.29 |
| Tennessee | 1,268 | 1,551 | 5,318 | 6,506 | 1,188 | 1.22 |
| Alabama | 1,112 | 1,480 | 4,046 | 5,388 | 1,342 | 1.33 |
| Mississippi | 945 | 1,690 | 2,219 | 3,968 | 1,749 | 1.79 |
| Louisiana | 1,161 | 1,255 | 4,438 | 4,799 | 361 | 1.08 |
| Arkansas | 1,067 | 1,342 | 2,251 | 2,833 | 582 | 1.26 |
| Oklahoma | 1,227 | 1,569 | 3,361 | 4,298 | 937 | 1.28 |
| Texas | 1,370 | 1,396 | 16,934 | 17,259 | 325 | 1.02 |
| Mountain | 1,372 | 1,701 | 13,345 | 16,553 | 3,208 | 1.24 |
| Montana | 1,305 | 1,588 | 979 | 1,191 | 212 | 1.22 |
| Idaho | 1,270 | 1,407 | 1,044 | 1,157 | 113 | 1.11 |
| Wyoming | 1,533 | 1,530 | 587 | 586 | -1 | 1.00 |
| Colorado | 1,503 | 1,739 | 3,850 | 4,455 | 605 | 1.16 |
| New Mexico | 1,101 | 2,101 | 1,273 | 2,429 | 1,156 | 1.91 |
| Arizona | 1,383 | 1,696 | 3,100 | 3,801 | 701 | 1.23 |
| Utah | 1,181 | 1,560 | 1,436 | 1,897 | 461 | 1.32 |
| Nevada | 1,795 | 1,729 | 1,077 | 1,037 | -40 | .96 |

TABLE 3 (con't)

| | Per Capita Taxes | Per Capita Expenditures | Taxes (million $s) | Expenditures (million $s) | Net Flow (million $s) | Spending - Taxes Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pacific | $ 1,650 | $ 1,904 | $ 47,019 | $ 54,257 | $ 7,238 | 1.15 |
| Washington | 1,602 | 2,023 | 5,743 | 7,254 | 1,511 | 1.26 |
| Oregon | 1,486 | 1,360 | 3,426 | 3,135 | -291 | .92 |
| California | 1,670 | 1,891 | 35,664 | 40,388 | 4,724 | 1.13 |
| Alaska | 1,920 | 3,620 | 718 | 1,354 | 636 | 1.89 |
| Hawaii | 1,672 | 2,421 | 1,468 | 10,402 | 658 | 1.45 |

Source: Government Research Corporation, Washington,D.C., National Journal, July 2, 1977.

is, indeed, perplexing in the light of their favorable treatment in the allocation of federal largesse.

The distribution of military installations has special relevance for the migration process. Migrants possess a very narrow range of information about potential destinations, and many are dependent on information obtained from visiting other places or from friends or relatives who visit or live elsewhere. As a result of their military service, many men and women become acquainted with the South and West and more specifically, with what it was like to live there. After completing their military obligation or perhaps years later, many of them returned. Post World War II migration to Arizona and Phoenix can be traced to air force experience during and after the war. Officials at the Del Webb Corporation, builders of Sun City, Arizona, one of the Southwest's largest retirement communities, have found military service in Arizona to be a common denominator among many past and current migrants to the community. The effects of military installation location in the Sunbelt may be just beginning to be realized, and the long-term consequences could be even greater.

To the extent that the federal retirement system and federal regulations governing private plans have made retired persons more financially secure, they may be seen as having induced migration to Sunbelt areas. As more retired persons possess the financial means to change their residence, they have sought locations with climates conducive to a leisure-centered life style.

Federal policy governing the number and origin of foreign immigrants has also affected growth in the Sunbelt. Although foreign immigrants can't be thought of as interregional movers in the usual sense, they do represent

migrants into a region and are certainly a form of growth. Alonso (1972) mentions the imprint of Cubans in the Miami area and Orientals in San Francisco and along the West Coast. Certainly the lax policy regarding Mexican farm workers has contributed to in-migration in California, Texas and Arizona. Although they are not included in official counts, illegal aliens represent a form of migration whose economic, social and political presence must be recognized.

Another provocative issue involves future federal action toward Vietnamese boat people. In that the majority of the refugees seem to prefer locations in temperate climates, settlement is great in the Los Angeles area and in the Gulf Coast region. If, as proposed, monthly quotas are increased to 14,000 per month, the Sunbelt stands to experience a large influx of people.

Themes in the teaching of population geography should be altered to reflect these changes in the U. S. population distribution. I have found students to be particularily interested in policy oriented questions especially those involving illegal aliens. I don't see how one can teach population geography either from a U. S. or international perspective and not stress the issues of undocumented aliens. They play an important role in contemporary population redistribution, and a large share of future population growth (whether or not we choose to count it) will undoubtedly come from illegal immigration. In addition, interesting comparisons can be drawn with the guest workers of Western and Eastern Europe. Essentially, they provide a similar function in that they fill jobs unwanted by the indigenous population, but they are handled differently in the American and

European context. Recognition of this can lead to an interesting set of discussion questions involving population distribution policy.

## Subregional Patterns

After years of decline America's nonmetropolitan areas have recently experienced rapid rates of population growth largely as a result of positive rates of net migration. The first to identify this turnabout in traditional growth patterns was Beale (1975) who found faster growth rates in non-metropolitan counties than in metropolitan ones during the early 1970s. Between 1970 and 1973 SMSAs grew at a rate of 2.9 percent while non-metropolitan counties adjacent to SMSAs grew by 4.7 percent and nonadjacent ones increased by 3.7 percent. Since the initial report by Beale, geographers, regional scientists, rural sociologists and others have displayed an avid interest in the process of nonmetropolitan growth and migration, its causes and consequences (Morrison, 1976; Tucker, 1976; Roseman, 1977; Sternlieb and Hughes, 1977; Wardwell, 1977; McCarthy and Morrison, 1976).

Examination of Table 4 will provide an overview of the nonmetropolitan growth experience and its various components. Absolute population change is given for SMSAs exceeding 1.5 million inhabitants in 1970, smaller SMSAs and nonmetropolitan areas. Between 1960 and 1970 population growth in the U. S. was largely metropolitan in character. Net migration was positive in metropolitan areas and negative in nonmetropolitan areas. The 1970s witnessed a turnabout in these patterns such that net migration became positive (and quite substantial in size) in nonmetropolitan areas and the largest declines occurred, not too surprisingly, in large metropolitan areas.

Table 4 also provides a breakdown of these patterns by major census regions. Substantial growth in large metropolitan areas of the Northeast

TABLE 4 COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE IN REGIONS BY METROPOLITAN AREA STATUS*, 1960-1975 ('000s)

| | NET CHANGE | | NATURAL INCREASE | | NET MIGRATION | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1960-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1975 | 1960-1970 | 1970-1975 |
| United States | 2399 | 1952 | 2046 | 1456 | 354 | 496 |
| Large metropolitan | 1221 | 285 | 804 | 539 | 417 | -254 |
| Other metropolitan | 968 | 969 | 750 | 576 | 218 | 393 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 211 | 698 | 492 | 341 | -281 | 357 |
| Northeast | 438 | 79 | 397 | 218 | 41 | -139 |
| Large metropolitan | 262 | -73 | 236 | 123 | 26 | -196 |
| Other metropolitan | 125 | 59 | 112 | 63 | 13 | -4 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 51 | 93 | 49 | 32 | 2 | 61 |
| North Central | 497 | 217 | 567 | 391 | -68 | -175 |
| Large metropolitan | 254 | 4 | 249 | 171 | 6 | -167 |
| Other metropolitan | 201 | 95 | 188 | 140 | 13 | -45 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 43 | 118 | 130 | 81 | -87 | 37 |
| South | 785 | 1079 | 700 | 554 | 86 | 525 |
| Large metropolitan | 347 | 260 | 152 | 124 | 195 | 136 |
| Other metropolitan | 377 | 506 | 312 | 267 | 65 | 239 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 61 | 312 | 236 | 163 | -174 | 150 |
| West | 679 | 578 | 385 | 294 | 293 | 284 |
| Large metropolitan | 357 | 94 | 168 | 122 | 189 | -28 |
| Other metropolitan | 266 | 309 | 139 | 106 | 126 | 203 |
| Nonmetropolitan | 56 | 175 | 78 | 66 | -22 | 109 |

*Large metropolitan areas are those having 1.5 million inhabitants or more in 1970.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Estimates of the Population of Counties and Metropolitan Areas: July 1, 1974 and 1975." Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 709, September, 1977.

and North Central in the 1960s changed to declines or very slow growth during the 1970s. Although smaller metropolitan areas continued to grow during the 1970s, nonmetropolitan areas accounted for most of the population increase. In the South and West, growth during the 1970s was predominantly metropolitan in character although nonmetropolitan areas still exhibited population increase.

Reasons for the shift in migration patterns are many and varied. Morrison (1977) has outlined three dimensions to recent growth and in-migration in nonmetropolitan areas. The first involves decentralization of metropolitan economic activity into surrounding nonmetropolitan areas, a leakage or spillover effect. This is associated with improvements in transportation such that business can be efficiently conducted at greater distances from the central city. The second dimension involves a large-scale change in the geography of economic opportunity such that industry has moved into nonmetropolitan areas and energy extraction has created jobs and population growth in previously declining areas especially in the West and Appalachia. A change in the American life style represents the third, and perhaps most significant dimension of nonmetropolitan growth. An increase in retired persons who are free from employment-related concerns, and a growing emphasis on quality of life considerations among people of all ages have made nonmetropolitan areas more attractive to potential migrants (Williams and Safranko, 1978).

Residential preference surveys show that a majority of Americans desire residence in small and rural areas (Zuiches and Fuguitt, 1972; Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1977). When asked about the reasons, people list quality of life attributes such as clean air and water, a nice place to raise children, and

freedom from perceived urban ills like congestion and crime. With increaed incomes and leisure, a growing number of people appear to be acting out their residential preferences with moves to nonmetropolitan areas. I find that an interesting exercise in both population and urban geography courses is to poll the students on their residential preferences. I usually find that their preferences reflect those of the nation as a whole, and an interesting discussion of our national values oftentimes ensues.

If people are, in fact, realizing the preferences that they have had all along, then just what part has the government played in the process of nonmetropolitan migration? The government has not set about consciously to stimulate a "rural renaissance" or "nonmetropolitan resurgence," but its actions have played a lubricative role. By making nonmetropolitan areas more accessible to national markets and population, the federal interstate system improved their desirability for industrial as well as recreational purposes. On a smaller scale, there is little doubt that freeways have promoted ex-urban development beyond the official margins of SMSAs in adjacent nonmetropolitan areas.

In addition, improvements in the federal retirement system or federally induced improvements in private plans enable retired persons to seek residences in places where they can use their leisure time more productively and in places where their fixed incomes go further. In Northern Michigan, many retired persons have transformed long-time vacation homes into year-round residences (Marans and Wellman, 1978). In so doing they stimulate service activity and create regional multiplier effects.

Federal energy policy favoring greater self-sufficiency and emphasizing coal production has been a contributing factor in the evolution of a growing

number of "boom towns" particularily in the West. Although rapid in-migration associated with energy exploitation is initially welcomed as a symbol of prosperity and a welcome relief from selective out-migration, its consequences are frequently very disruptive to the traditional social and political life of the community (Cortese and Jones, 1977; Ploch, 1970; Schwarzweller, 1979).

Gilmore and Duff (1975) conducted an in-depth study of the impacts of rapid population growth due to in-migration in Sweetwater County, Wyoming, an important coal producing center in the West that has attracted attention in the news media due to reports of local corruption and organized crime. Due to expansion in coal mining activities, county population grew from 18,391 in 1970 to 36,900 by the end of 1974 representing an annual growth rate of 19 percent. Besides the crime problem, Gilmore and Duff reported that labor productivity in the mines had declined due to high turnover and labor shortages and the overall quality of life had deteriorated because of the inability of local institutions to provide adequate housing, health services, schools, and retailing. Many other boom towns have sprung up in areas adjacent to mineral resources in the nonmetropolitan West. Each has a set of unique problems, but in all cases, they are the direct result of the inability of formally stable communities to accommodate relatively large numbers of newcomers in short periods of time. Class discussion here should focus on the kinds of adjustments for newcomers, oldtimers and nonmetropolitan communities of large-scale immigration. What do big city people look for in smaller communities? What happens when their expectations come in conflict with the generally more conservative views of long-time residents? I had a student do an excellent report on the community and

personal adjustment problems of large-scale immigration to Sweetwater County, Wyoming.

## Policy Consequences of Migration

Up to this point, the focus of discussion has been on policy as the causal factor and changing migration patterns as the outcome. It can also be argued that migration affects the regional balance of population and population characteristics and this, in turn, affects federal, regional and local policies. Migration and policy can best then be regarded as interdependent processes, and this is a point that is particularily relevant in population geography.

The most obvious consequence of recent migration-induced regional shifts in population will be the reapportionment of Congressional representatives after the 1980 Census. The Constitution provides that representatives are apportioned among states according to population, and that each state must have at least one representative. Since 1921, a base of 435 seats has been used in all years except between 1960 and 1962 when the number was increased to 437 in order to accommodate for the inclusion of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. Table 5 shows the historical distribution of representation among regions and states, and using U. S. Bureau of Economic Analysis population projections for 1980, an attempt was made to estimate changes that will occur after release of the 1980 Census. As expected, the Mid-Atlantic and East Central regions promise to be the big losers while the South experiences the biggest gains. Western regions will pick up a few seats, but these gains will be small in comparison to those in the South. Not surprisingly, the reallocation of representation and hence power is worrisome to many Northern politicians. In a speech before the

TABLE 6 APPORTIONMENT OF HOUSE REPRESENTATIVES BY STATE AND REGION: 1910-1970
ESTIMATES FOR 1980

| | 1910 | 1930 | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | Estimated 1980 | Change 1970-1980 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New England | 32 | 29 | 28 | 28 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 0 |
| Maine | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| New Hampshire | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Vermont | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Massachusetts | 16 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| Rhode Island | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Connecticut | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Mid-Atlantic | 91 | 93 | 92 | 87 | 83 | 79 | 73 | -6 |
| New York | 43 | 45 | 45 | 43 | 41 | 39 | 35 | -4 |
| New Jersey | 12 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 0 |
| Pennsylvania | 36 | 34 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 23 | -2 |
| East North Central | 86 | 90 | 87 | 87 | 88 | 86 | 82 | -4 |
| Ohio | 22 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 21 | -2 |
| Indiana | 13 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| Illinois | 27 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 22 | -2 |
| Michigan | 13 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 0 |
| West North Central | 57 | 47 | 44 | 42 | 37 | 35 | 34 | -1 |
| Minnesota | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Iowa | 11 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Missouri | 16 | 13 | 13 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| North Dakota | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| South Dakota | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -1 |
| Nebraska | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 |
| Kansas | 8 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| South Atlantic | 56 | 54 | 56 | 60 | 63 | 65 | 70 | +5 |
| Delaware | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Maryland | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | +1 |
| Virginia | 10 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| West Virginia | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| North Carolina | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 |
| South Carolina | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Georgia | 12 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| Florida | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 15 | 19 | +4 |

| | 1910 | 1930 | 1940 | 1950 | 1960 | 1970 | Estimated change 1980 | 1970-1980 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| South Central | 80 | 79 | 79 | 74 | 70 | 69 | 72 | +3 |
| Kentucky | 11 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| Tennessee | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | +1 |
| Alabama | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| Mississippi | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| Louisiana | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Arkansas | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| Oklahoma | 8 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 0 |
| Texas | 18 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 26 | +2 |
| Mountain | 14 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 19 | 20 | +1 |
| Montana | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Idaho | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Wyoming | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Colorado | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| New Mexico | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Arizona | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | +1 |
| Utah | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Nevada | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Pacific | 19 | 29 | 33 | 43 | 52 | 57 | 59 | +2 |
| Washington | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| Oregon | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | +1 |
| California | 11 | 20 | 23 | 30 | 38 | 43 | 44 | +1 |
| Alaska | x | x | x | x | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Hawaii | x | x | x | x | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

x Was not a state in that year.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Population: 1970-Characteristics of the Population, Vol. Pt. 1, U.S. Summary, 1973; U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, Population, Personal Income and Earnings by State: Projections to 2000, October, 1977.

White House Conference on Balanced Growth and Economic Development Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1978) of New York warned of increased regional rivalries and factionalism. He was, of course, making a plea for a reorientation of federal expenditures and a bail-out of New York City.

A related issue involving interaction between migration and federal activity involves federal programs like revenue sharing whose funding formulas use population as one input. Morrison (1977) points out that regions or communities that are unable to show population gains or even population stability may experience dereases in program support. Declining regions that appear to need aid the most may very well lose federal support, thus making it more difficult for them to prevent future out-migration if, indeed, that is their goal.

Increased decentralization outside official SMSA limits into adjacent nonmetropolitan areas will almost surely involve increased commuting and more automobile travel. Implications in the area of energy policy are considerable. Large-scale ex-urban development as a form of nonmetropolitan growth and migration may be inconsistent with a national effort of more frugal energy utilization.

Retirement-related migration is a factor in both Sunbelt and nonmetropolitan migration trends, and the changing distibution of elderly can potentially have enormous implications for the regions and communities involved. Older persons impact politics in their destinations by electing representatives who are in tune with their views. The high voter registration and turnout among elderly persons make them a very potent political force in destination regions.

This impact is accentuated by the growing trend for elderly persons to concentrate in retirement communities. In Maricopa County, Arizona (Phoenix SMSA), Sun City is an example of such a community whose political clout is recognized by local politicians and those intereted in the political process. In 1977 the population of Sun City was 43,000 and represented a seemingly small relative proportion of the total county population of almost 1.3 million. When one considers that virtually the entire population of Sun City is of voting age and, more importantly, falls into an age category in which the propensity to vote is very high and that in the county as a whole there are only about 900,000 persons of voting age many of them young adults and minorities among whom the propensity to vote is typically low, the impact of 43,000 spatially concentrated elderly persons looms large. Sun City residents play a very important role in determining the character of local, state, and national representation and indirectly on the kinds of decisions that are supported by those representatives.

## Conclusion

Although the federal government does not have an official migration policy, many federal activities impact population distribution and migration. Almost all policies have territorial consequences and, as such, they affect certain locales and regions more than others. At a regional level, federal spending, immigration and retirement migration have reinforced ongoing processes of population growth and in-migration in Sunbelt regions. At a sub-regional scale, migration flows have shifted such that nonmetropolitan areas are experiencing high rates of population growth. Relevant federal actions involve areas of transportation, energy, and retirement.

Issues of population distribution and related governmental policy should represent an essential component of a course in population geography. In the past, attention has been focused on action that affects the size of the national population such as family planning activity, compulsory education and antiabortion and contraception laws. It has been argued here that all governmental policy has territorial consequences and, therefore, affects the distribution of the national population. Policies that impact population distribution should be primary concerns of students and teachers of population geography.

Various ways of integrating the aforementioned changes in population distribution into courses on population geography has been suggested. In essence, I contend that population redistribution and its prime determinant, migration, should occupy a prominent position in the study of population geography. Moreover, policy implications of population redistribution are profound, and they can prove to be interesting and relevant components of any course in population geography.

## References


Alonso, W. 1972. "Problems, Purposes, and Implicit Policies for a National Strategy of Urbanization," in Population Distribution and Policy, edited by S. M. Mazie (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Beale, C. L. 1975. The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America. Economic Development Division, Economic Research Series No. 65 (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Agriculture).

Cortese, C. F. and B. Jones. 1977. "The Sociological Analysis of Boom Towns," Western Sociological Journal, 8:76-90.

Fuguitt, G. V. and J. J. Zuiches. 1975. "Residential Preferences and Population Distribution," Demography, 12:491-504.

Gilmore, J. and M. Duff. 1975. Boomtown Growth Management: Rock Springs-Green River, Wyoming, (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press).

Gober-Meyers, P. 1978. "Interstate Migration and Economic Growth: A Simultaneous Equations Approach," Environment and Planning A, 10:241-1252.

Government Research Corporation. 1977. National Journal, July 2, 1977.

Greenwood, M. 1969. "An Analysis of the Determinants of Labor Mobility in the U. S.," Review of Economics and Statistics, 51:189-194.

McCarthy, K. F. and P. A. Morrison. 1978. The Changing Demographic and Economic Structure of Nonmetropolitan Areas in the 1970s, Rand Paper Series No. P-6062, (Santa Monica, Rand Corporation).

Marans, R. W. and J. D. Wellman. 1978. The Quality of Nonmetropolitan Living: Evaluations, Behavior and Expectations of Northern Michigan Residents, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Survey Research Center).

Morrison, P. A. 1976. "Rural Renaissance in America?" Population Bulletin, 31:3-26.

Morrison, P. A. 1977. Emerging Public Concerns Over U. S. Population Movements in an Era of Slowing Growth, Rand Paper Series No. P-5973 (Santa Monica: Rand Corporation).

Moynihan, P. A. 1978. "How to Politicize the Economics of Growth--And Why Not To." Address before the White House Conference on Balanced Growth and Economic Development in Washington, D. C.

Okun, B. 1968. "Interstate Population Migration and State Income Inequality: A Simultaneous Equations Approach," Economic Development and Cultural Change, 16:297-311.

Ploch, L. A. 1978. "The Reversal in Migration Patterns--Some Rural Development Consequences," Rural Sociology, 43:293-303.

Roseman, C. C. 1977. Changing Migration Patterns Within the United States, Resource Papers for College Geography No. 77-2 (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers).

Rundquist, B. S., P. G. Bock, A. M. Champagne, and K. F. Johnson. 1972. "The Impact of Defense Cutbacks on Employment and Migration," in Population Distribution and Policy, edited by S. M. Maize (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).

Schwarzweller, H. K. 1979. "Migration and the Changing Rural Scene," Rural Sociology, 44:7-23.

Schwind, P. 1975. "A General Field Theory of Migration: United States, 1955-60," Economic Geography, 51:1-16.

"The Second War Between the States." 1976. Business Week, April 17, 1976:92-98.

Sternlieb, G. and J. W. Hughes. 1977. "New Regional and Metropolitan Realities of America," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 42:227-241.

Sutton H. 1978. "Sunbelt vs. Frostbelt: A Second Civil War?" Saturday Review, April 15, 1978:28-37.

Tucker, J. C. 1976. "Changing Patterns of Migration Between Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Areas in the United States: Recent Evidence," Demography, 13:435-443.

"U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1971. "Preliminary Intercensal Estimates of States and Components of Population Change, 1960 to 1970," Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 460.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1973. Census of Population, Vol. 1, Pt. 1, U. S. Summary.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1975. "Geographic Mobility of the Population, 1970-1975," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 285.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1977. "Estimates of the Population of Counties and Metropolitan Areas: July 1, 1974 and 1975," Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 709.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1978. "Geographic Mobility of the Population, 1975-1978," Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 331.

U. S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. 1977. Population, Personal Income and Earnings by State: Projections to 2000, October, 1977.

Wardwell, J. M. 1977. "Equilibrium and Change in Nonmetropolitan Growth," Rural Sociology, 432:156-179.

Watkins, A. J. 1978. "Intermetropolitan Migration and the Rise of the Sunbelt," Social Science Quarterly, 59:553-561.

Williams, J. D. and A. J. Safranko. 1978. Migration Motivations for Population Turnaround in Nonmetropolitan Areas, Department of Agricultural Economics, Illinois Agricultural Staff Papers No. 78, S-4 (Champaign: University of Illinois).

Zuiches, J. J. and G. V. Fuguitt. 1972. "Residential Preferences: Implications for Population Redistribution in Nonmetropolitan Areas," Population Distribution and Policy, edited by S. M. Mazie (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office).